IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

INCOME TAX REFERENCE No 326 of 1984

For Approval	and	Signature:
--------------	-----	------------

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE C.K.THAKKER and MR.JUSTICE A.L.DAVE

- 1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed : YES to see the judgements?
- 2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
- 3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy : NO of the judgement?
- 4. Whether this case involves a substantial question : NO of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder?
- 5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

COMMISSIONER OF INCOME-TAX

Versus

WINTEX MILLS LTD

Appearance:

MR BB NAIK WITH MR MANISH R BHATT for Petitioner MR DA MEHTA & RK PATEL FOR MR KC PATEL for Respondent No. $\,1\,$

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE C.K.THAKKER and

MR.JUSTICE A.L.DAVE

Date of decision: 01/09/1999

ORAL JUDGEMENT (Per Thakkar, J.)

1. The following question of law has been referred for the opinion of this Court :-

"Whether on the facts and in the circumstances of the case, the Tribunal was right in law in coming

to the conclusion that under the provisions of Section 40A(8) of the I.T. Act, 1961 for the purpose of determining the disallowance, the net amount of interest has to be taken into account?"

- 2. For the assessment year 1978-79, the assessee debited interest of Rs.13,18,829/-, against which it had received interest of Rs.1,38,205. The Income Tax Officer disallowed interest under Section 40A(8) of the Income Tax Act, 1961 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act") on the gross amount of interest without deducting interest received. In appeal, the Commissioner of Income Tax (Appeals) upheld the decision of the Income Tax Officer. In further appeal by the assessee, the Tribunal held that for determining the disallowance, the net amount of interest should be considered.
- 3. According to the Tribunal, the point at controversy was whether in order to determine disallowance of interest under Section 40A(8) of the Act, the amount of interest should be taken on gross basis or on net basis. Considering the relevant provisions of the Act and on the basis of "broad commercial principles", the Tribunal observed that it was well settled that making entries in the books is not determinative of the liability and that the liability of an assessee has to be decided on actual income without reference to the method or manner in which the entries are made in the book of accounts. In other words, the expenditure incurred towards interest cannot be determined de hors the interest received. The appeal filed by the assessee was accordingly allowed.
- 4. Though no direct decision under Section 40A(8) of the Act is brought to our notice, there is a decision of the Honourable Supreme Court Keshaji Ravji and Co. v. C.I.T., 183 ITR 1 on interpretation of Section 40(b) of the Act. Section 40A and Section 40(b) both contain non-obstantive clause. Sub-section (8) of Section 40A, as stood then, read as under:-
 - "(8) Where the assessee being a company (other than a banking company or a financial company), incurs any expenditure by way of interest of any deposit received by it, fifteen per cent of such expenditure shall not be allowed as a deduction.

Explanation: - In this sub-section, -

which the Banking Regulations Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), applies and includes any bank or banking institution referred to in section 51 of the Act;

- (b) 'deposit' means any deposit of money
 with, and includes any money borrowed by
 a company, but does not include any
 amount received by the company-
- (i) from the Central Government or any State Government or any local authority, or from any other source where the repayment of the amount is guaranteed by the Central Government or a State Government;

- (iv) as a loan from any institution or body
 specified in the list of the Tenth
 Schedule or such other institution or
 body as the Central Government may,
 having regard to the nature and objects
 of the institution or body, by
 notification in the Official Gazette,
 specify in this behalf;
- (v) from any other company;

- (viii) by way of subscription to any share,
 stock, bond or debenture (such bond or
 debenture being secured by a charge or a
 lien on the assets of the company)
 pending the allotment of the said share,
 stock, bond or debenture, or by way of
 advance payment of any moneys uncalled
 and unpaid upon any shares in the
 company, if such moneys are not repayable
 in accordance with the articles of
 association of the company;
- (ix) as a loan from any person where the loan
 is secured by the creation of a mortgage,
 charge or pledge of any assets of the
 company (such loan being hereafter in
 this sub-clause referred to as the
 relevant loan) and the amount of the
 relevant loan, together with the amount
 of any other prior debt or loan secured
 by the creation of a mortgage, charge or
 pledge of such assets, is not more that
 seventy-five per cent of the price that
 such assets would ordinarily fetch on
 sale in the open market on the date of
 creation of the mortgage, charge or
 pledge for the relevant loan;
- (c) 'financial company' means-
- (i) a hire-purchase finance company, that is to say, a company which carries on its principal business, hire-purchase transactions or the financing of such transactions; or
- (ii) an investment company, that is to say, a company which carries on, as its principal business, the acquisition of shares, stock, bonds, debentures, debenture stock, or securities issued by the Government or a local authority, or other marketable securities of a like nature; or
- (iii) a housing financing company, that is to say, a company which carries on, as its principal business, the business of financing of acquisition or construction of houses, including acquisition or development of land in connection

therewith;

- (v) a mutual benefit finance company, it is to say, a company which carries on, as its principal business, the business of acceptance of deposits from its members and which is declared by the Central Government under section 620A of the Companies Act, 1956 (1 of 19656) to be a Nidhi or Mutual Benefit Society;

Section 40(b) read as under :-

- "40. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in sections 30 to 39, the following amounts shall not be deducted in computing the income chargeable under the head 'Profits and gains of business or profession'-
- (a)
- (b) in the case of any firm, any payment of interest, salary, bonus, commission or remuneration made by the firm to any partner of the firm.
- Explanation 1.-Where interest is paid by a firm to any partner of the firm who has also paid interest to the firm, the amount of interest to be disallowed under this clause shall be limited to the amount by which the payment of interest by the firm to the partner exceeds the payment of interest by the partner to the firm.
- Explanation 2-Where an individual is a partner in a firm on behalf, or for the benefit, of any other person (such partner and the other person

being hereinafter referred to as 'partner in a representative capacity' and 'person so represented' respectively),-

- (i) interest paid by the firm to such individual or by such individual to the firm otherwise than as partner in a representative capacity, shall not be taken into account for the purposes of this clause;
- (ii) interest paid by the firm to such individual or by such individual to the firm as partner in a representative capacity and interest paid by the firm to the person so represented or by the person so represented to the firm, shall be taken into account for the purposes of this clause.
- Explanation 3.- Where an individual is a partner in a firm otherwise than as partner in a representative capacity, interest paid by the firm to such individual shall not be taken into account for the purposes of this clause, if such interest is received by him on behalf, or for the benefit, of any other person."
- 5. It was contended on behalf of the assess before the Apex Court that interest payable by the partners to the firm pursuant to the agreement between the parties was of the same nature as that payable by the firm to the partners on the capital brought in by them. It was, therefore, urged that the interest paid to and received from a partner are both integral part of a method adopted by the partners for adjusting the division of profits and, in that sense, both payments partake the same character.
- 6. Referring to various decisions, the Honourable Supreme Court upheld the contention. It observed:
 - "We, accordingly, accept the submission of Shri
 Ramachandran on this point. In our opinion,
 where two or more transactions on which interest
 is paid to or received from the partner by the
 firm are shown to have the element of mutuality
 and are referable to the funds of the partnership

as such, there is no reason why section 40(b) should be so construed as to exclude in quantifying the interest on the basis of such mutuality. In such circumstances, the interest, if any, paid to a partner by the firm in excess of what is received from the partner could alone be excluded from deduction under section 40(b)."

- 5. In our opinion, the ratio laid down by the Apex Court in Keshavji Ravji & Company (supra) can be invoked by the assessee and the principle underlying section 40(b) (as then stood) would also apply to the provisions of section 40A(8) (as then stood). In our opinion, therefore, the Tribunal was right in allowing the appeal filed by the assessee.
- 6. For the foregoing reasons, in our opinion, the question referred to us deserves to be answered in affirmative, i.e. in favour of assessee and against revenue. Reference is accordingly disposed of. In the facts and circumstances, no order as to costs.

```
[ C.K. THAKKAR, J. ]
```

[A.L. DAVE, J.]

gt